

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

PIN	3978	COUNTY	Multiple Counties
APPLICANT	Natural Heritage Institute	AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$500,000
PROJECT TITLE	Sierra Meadows: Developing an Integrated Regional Water Management Plan	TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$760,000

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Develop integrated water quality, quantity, and habitat restoration strategies and projects that protect and restore wetland resource in the Sierra Meadows. Attenuate flood flows and promoting water quality under a range of climate change scenarios in the Sierra Meadows.

WORK PLAN - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

Score: 15

Comment: Specific work items are described and corresponding sub-tasks, deliverables, milestones and work staff qualifications and assignments are presented. The detailed schedule includes time frames and deadlines for tasks and sub-tasks. A detailed budget is presented with hours/costs associated with tasks, sub-tasks and work staff. In-kind services are used to generate the \$260,000 match. In-kind services are provided by UCD, USFWS, CDF&G, NHI, and SYRCL.

DESCRIPTION OF REGION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific description that adequately documents the region. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 4

Comment: The physical and infrastructure characteristics of the region are well displayed. Major land-use is listed, but not consistently described. The applicant would have scored higher if the jurisdictions of the various participating entities and the water-related infrastructure were described in more detail.

OBJECTIVES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific planning objectives. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 10

Comment: The objectives included in the application are fairly broad and are related primarily to local system assessment and statewide objectives. They are supported by the proposed IRWMP detailed in the application and will be met by subsequent projects identified in the planning process.

INTEGRATION OF WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented how water management strategies will be integrated. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 10

Comment: The proposal indicates an understanding of how selected water management strategies work together to produce some synergistic effect. The applicant proposes to convene a planning forum to analyze integration opportunities and identify and prioritize strategies and projects to feed into the final IRWMP.

IMPLEMENTATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed plan implementation. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 8

Comment: The workplan, budget, and schedule are well correlated and address the following: implementation schedule, institutional structure, and performance assessment. There could have been more discussion of performance monitoring and contingency measures for poor performance or infeasible conditions such as interagency or jurisdictionally overlapping plan conflicts. There is no discussion of NPS management measures and practices.

IMPACTS AND BENEFITS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately presented and documented the impacts and benefits of the Plan. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 10

Comment: The impacts and benefits of the IRWMP are provided in sufficient detail to foresee how the IRWMP would be used in key management areas such as water supply operations, flood management, and habitat health. Potential impacts will be assessed on a project-by-project basis. Reviews and assessments of impacts will be performed under CEQA and NEPA directives and a review of actions proposed in the projects will be performed as part of the development of the IRWMP.

DATA AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 5

Comment: The proposal lists existing databases that will be merged to support the proposed IRWMP. The number of sites, types of data collected, who collected the data, and how the data will be integrated into the IRWMP are described. The proposal describes how data gaps will be identified. The applicant states that previous and future technical studies have and will be performed to support the proposed IRWMP. Some of the monitoring activity may not provide adequate information to draw conclusions (e.g. hydrologic parameters of storage and filtration capacity may require more than one year of data collection to define the system dynamics of flow and quality).

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

DATA MANAGEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data management procedures. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 5

Comment: The process for gathering and managing information is described. The applicant states that four statewide databases will be provided with an ArcInfo project map. The data from at least three existing databases focused on the Sierras will be merged into a single database and accessible for the public via the management group's website.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented stakeholder involvement concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 5

Comment: The applicant lists three mechanisms that will be used to involve stakeholders and describes the processes/workshops that allow stakeholders to influence and implement/adopt the IRWMP. The applicant lists water-related entities that are included in the planning process. Environmental justice concerns will be identified during stakeholder workshops. The applicant states that focused outreach will be conducted to insure DACs will be included.

DISADVANTAGE COMMUNITIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented disadvantaged community concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 5

Comment: The applicant lists existing DACs within the region. The applicant states that DACs depend on economies of agriculture, tourism, and resource extraction, which all rely on good water quantity and quality. The applicant also states that improved water quality and quantity will promote timber and recreational attractions to support local economies. Improved water quantity and quality would help people in lower income brackets who live off the land via fishing, hunting, and growing their own food. Focused outreach will be conducted to insure DACs will be included.

RELATION TO LOCAL PLANNING - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented the Plan's relationship to local planning efforts. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 4

Comment: The proposal lists specific plans that will be reviewed to determine if the proposed strategies and projects are reflected or absent in local planning documents. It states that based on the review above, a Management Group will develop actions as part of the implementation of the IRWMP to resolve any conflicts. However, the local planning documents would not be included as a foundation material, but simply reviewed to identify potential conflicts.

AGENCY COORDINATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented agency coordination issues. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 5

Comment: The applicant states that the Management Group will include members who belong to agencies and organizations that have significant management control and interests. Differing institutional needs and goals will be identified and worked out using the Nominal Group Technique. The invitation to participate is the stated method of expanding the Management Group to include agencies with significant jurisdiction over watersheds within the planning area.

TOTAL SCORE: 86